

## REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 8, 2005 in which Claims 1-26 were rejected. With this response, Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23 and 24 are amended and Claims 27-35 are added. Claims 1-35 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

### I. Rejection of Claims 1-26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Based Upon Moshir.

Paragraphs 1-12 rejected Claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Moshir et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0100036. Claims 1, 8, 14 and 21, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Moshir et al.

Each of independent Claims 1, 8, 14 and 21, as amended, recites “receiving an electronic message including configuration data from an undesignated website through a firewall.” Moshir fails to disclose, teach or suggest a method (Claim 1), a computer instruction signal (Claim 8), a control system (Claim 14) or an article of manufacture (Claim 21) in which an electronic message including hard copy output engine configuration data is received from an undesignated website through a firewall.

Moshir does not receive hard copy output engine configuration. Moreover, Moshir does not configure a hard copy output engine using such configuration data. The Office Action asserts that paragraph 126 of Moshir teaches configuring a hard copy output engine using configuration data. However, the Office Action’s characterization of Moshir is incorrect. Paragraph 126 does not teach configuring of a hard copy output engine. In contrast, paragraph 126 of Moshir merely discloses configuring a computer. Paragraph 126 specifically states “a recommended configuration 704 for the target computer 500 is placed on the update server 528 or on the repository site 600.” (emphasis added) (Moshir, ¶ 126). Nowhere does Moshir disclose receiving an electronic message including hard copy output engine configuration data or configuring the hard copy output engine data. Thus, Claims 1, 8, 14 and 21, as amended, overcome the rejections based upon Moshir. Claims 2-7, Claims 9-13, Claims 15-20 and Claims 22-26 depend from Claims 1, 14 and 21, respectively, and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

II. Added Claims.

With this response, Claims 27-35 are added. Claims 27-35 recite features which are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

Added Claim 27 recites forming hard copy output engine configuration data on a first side of a firewall based upon input received from a second side of the firewall and transmitting an electronic message including the configuration data to a hard copy output engine on the second side of the firewall. The prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest forming hard copy output engine configuration data on a first side of firewall based upon input received from a second side of the firewall and then transmitting an electronic message including the configuration data to a hard copy output engine on the second side of the firewall.

Claims 28-35 depend from Claim 27 and recite further features which are patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

Claim 28 depends from Claim 27 and recites that the electronic message comprises an email.

Claim 29 depends from Claim 27 and further recites that the electronic message is transmitted to a user station and is then forwarded to the hard copy output engine.

Claim 30 depends from Claim 27 and further recites configuring the hard copy output engine using the data.

Claim 31 depends from Claim 27 and further recites transmitting an address of the hard copy output engine from the second side of the firewall to the first side of the firewall.

Claim 32 depends from Claim 27 and further recites that the configuration data designates a website on the first side of the firewall as a contact for the hard copy output engine, wherein the website was not previously designated as a contact.

Claim 33 depends from Claim 27 and further recites providing the input from the second side of the firewall to the first side of the firewall.

Claim 35 depends Claim 27 and recites receiving the message with a web server embedded in the hard copy output engine. The prior art of record fails to disclose any of the additional features recited in Claims 28-35. Thus, consideration and allowance of Claims 27-35 are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-35 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2027. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 7, 2005 By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22879  
Telephone: (414) 297-5710  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,276